DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 989 UD 019 782

TITLE Public Forum on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.
INSTITUTION Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 6 Oct 78
NOTE 28p.: Proceedings of a forum sponsored by the Nevada Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Las Vegas, Nevada, October 6, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights; Cultural Factors; Economic Factors; Equal Education; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Equal Protection; *Females; *Feminism; Political Power; *Sex Discrimination; Social Factors; *Social Integration; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS *Nevada

ABSTRACT

This report contains a number of papers which focus on the current legal status of women. The papers, presented at a public forum by various individuals, discuss the opportunities for women in the economic, social, cultural, and political life of the United States in general, and of Nevada in particular. A major issue addressed is the progress that has been made toward attaining equality between men and women and the barriers that still prevent full equality. A list of informational resources is included. (EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175989

Public Forum on Women's Rights and Responsibilities

—Proceedings of a public forum sponsored by the Nevada Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 6, 1978.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD019782

This publication is the proceedings of the Public Forum on Women's Rights and Responsibilities sponsored by the Nevada Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, statements made do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the Commission.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The Nevada Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
June 1979

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION
Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, Vice Chairman
Frankie Freeman
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.
Murray Saltzman

Louis Nuñez, *Staff Director*

Dear People:

The Nevada Advisory Committee, pursuant to its responsibility to advise the Commission on State civil rights issues, submits these proceedings on women's rights and responsibilities.

The members of the Nevada Advisory Committee found in 1978 that objective knowledge of the legal status of women in Nevada was negligible. Much discussion about equal rights and equal opportunities was clouded with emotion and recriminations. The Advisory Committee decided that providing a dispassionate forum to discuss the rights and responsibilities of women would contribute toward ensuring a well-informed public in the State.

A public forum was convened on October 6, 1978, in Las Vegas. Speakers reviewed the progress toward attaining equality between women and men and the barriers that still prevent full equality.

We urge your review of the proceedings.

Respectfully,

Woodrow Wilson, Chairperson

MEMBERSHIP
NEVADA ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE
U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Woodrow Wilson, Chair
Las Vegas

Marlene Coffey
Reno

Susan L. Deluca
Las Vegas

William Deutsch
Las Vegas

Jean Ford
Las Vegas

Donny L. Johnson
Minden

Erma L. O'Neal
Las Vegas

Fernando Romero
Las Vegas

Eddie B. Scott
Reno

Steven T. Walther
Reno

Preface

The Declaration of Independence proclaims that all men are created equal. Unfortunately, the word "men" has been taken too literally, resulting in the principle that women are created unequal. With this practice the rule, rather than the exception, the issue of the legal rights of women in American society has been debated throughout the history of our country.*

In 1972 the jurisdiction of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was extended to include discrimination on the basis of sex. In August 1978 the Commission released a report, *Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women,* that includes highlights on women's continued secondary place in our society. The Nevada Advisory Committee to the Commission decided that sharing information on issues such as those raised in *Social Indicators* would contribute toward ensuring a well-informed public in Nevada.

To disseminate information on the current legal status of women, the Nevada Advisory Committee chose a public forum. At this meeting, knowledgeable persons discussed the opportunities for women in the economic, social, cultural, and political life of this Nation and of this State. Speakers reviewed the progress toward attaining equality between men and women and the barriers that still prevent full equality.

The public forum convened October 6, 1978, in the Las Vegas City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada. It began with a welcome from a representative of the Governor of Nevada.

---

*U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *A Guide to Federal Laws and Regulations Prohibiting Sex Discrimination (July 1976) (revised), p. 1.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Nevada Advisory Committee wishes to thank the staff of the Commission's Western Regional Office, Los Angeles, California, for its help in the preparation of these proceedings. The proceedings were prepared by Gloria A. Lopez and Sally E. James. Editing assistance was provided by Thomas V. Pilla with support from Grace Diaz. Legal review assistance was provided by Laurie Campbell. All worked under the guidance of Philip Montez, Western Regional Director.

The staff of the Publications Support Center, Office of Management, was responsible for final preparation of the report for publication.

Contents

1. Welcome
James F. Wittenberg, Office of the Governor 1
2. Keynote Address
Stewart B. Oneglia, Director, Task Force on Sex Discrimination, U.S. Department of Justice 3
3. Panel Discussion
Cecilia Preciado de Burciaga, Assistant Provost for Faculty Affairs, Stanford University 7
Anne Follis, National President, Housewives for ERA 8
Mary Gojack, Nevada State Senate 9
Mildred Jeffrey, Chair, National Women's Political Caucus 11
Walter Nowak, Co-Director, Center for United Campus Ministry 12
Jan L. Tyler, Chair, Coordinating Committee, Utah Women's Conference 13
4. Informational Resources
Federal Government Agencies 17
Selected National Organizations 18

1. Welcome

James F. Wittenberg, State Personnel Director

Representing Governor Michael O'Callaghan of Nevada

From the beginning of Governor O'Callaghan's administration 8 years ago, he has vigorously encouraged the employment of women, ethnic minorities, and the handicapped in State government. A number of affirmative action steps have been taken to achieve the best possible results in this area. Minimum qualifications have been designed to allow for more reasonable entry in and to provide opportunities for career employees to progress to higher level, policymaking positions. Several years ago, volunteer experience became an acceptable qualification for positions in State government. Training opportunities have increased considerably. Of the training offerings that our agency made available to State employees last year, almost 60 percent of the participants were women.

More women are working today because it is necessary for them to work from an economic standpoint. Women have to work these days, and they work for the same reasons that men do, either to fully support or help support their families and themselves. It's time that everyone realizes that women want the same rewards from employment that men do. Women want the best paycheck they can earn; they want emotional satisfaction from their job; and they want to grow professionally in their work. Therefore, women have every right and should be every bit as interested as men in seeking jobs of higher responsibility and increased pay.

The Governor has encouraged their progress and has not found it a threat to his masculinity. To the contrary, he has carefully watched the professional growth of many women, and, when he felt they were ready, when their administrative talents developed and their instincts were on target, he moved these women into top administrative posts in State government. They in turn have delivered, in his opinion. They have met every expectation and, believe me, they are tough and fair, characteristics that are essential to successful management and administration.

Under the O'Callaghan administration, women for the first time in the history of Nevada State government are heading State agencies. A woman heads the Department of General Services, another heads the Department of Commerce, and another serves as director of the State CETA agency. A woman for the first time is a full-time member of the Public Service Commission, the State's utility regulatory agency. One-half of the professional staff of the Office of the Governor are women. No other Governor in the Nation can make that claim.

The number of unclassified jobs for which the Governor has the sole appointing authority is only 50. That's just about one-half of 1 percent of the entire State service. The remainder of the positions are filled on the basis of competitive examinations through the State's personnel system.

The Governor, however, has set policy and led by example. Since 1973 the percentage of State supervisory and administrative level positions held by women has almost doubled. In 1973, 22 percent of these higher level positions were held by women. Today, that percentage is 39 percent.

Also, women comprise 45 percent of the total work force today, compared to 42 percent in 1974. So there has certainly been an increase just from the standpoint of the number of women coming into the State work force. In 1977, 58 percent—practically 60 percent—of all the promotions in the State service went to women. These facts show that more women State employees are now seeking jobs of high responsibility, more so than they did 5 or 10 years ago. Women are now working in numerous occupational areas that 10 years ago were unheard of, and that's good. Some of those areas include forestry, parole and probation, engineering, drafting right of way, highway maintenance, and corrections, just to mention a few. Competition is good for the system; it is good for men, it is good for women, and it is good for the quality of government.

Valuable and useful experience can also come from serving on State advisory boards and commissions. The Governor has more than doubled the number of women serving on these boards and commissions. He has seen many of these women, through their experience in the decisionmaking on the boards and commissions, grow both professionally and in their personal lives.

There has been an equal emphasis in the area of ethnic minorities, where the work force has increased from 5.5 percent in 1971 to over 13 percent as of September 1978. The handicapped now comprise more than 4 percent of the State's work force, as compared to less than 2 percent when the Governor took office in 1971. Every ethnic minority group in State government has doubled its representation in the State work force, and some have increased sixfold. As an example of this fact, 60 minorities were employed in State government in 1971, compared to 366 in 1978.

Ladies and gentlemen, that seems to me to be real progress through initiative, capability through performance, not gender or ethnic origin. Women and minorities have taken giant steps during the O'Callaghan administration. It has been a pleasure to welcome you on behalf of the Governor.

2. Keynote Address

Stewart B. Oneglia

Ms. Oneglia is Director of the Task Force on Sex Discrimination, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice. Under a Presidental directive, the task force reviews Federal statutes, regulations, programs, policies, and procedures to identify sex discrimination and to suggest remedial proposals. In private practice, Ms. Oneglia specialized in domestic relations. She served as an associate judge, Orphans' Court, Prince George's County, Maryland. She is a member of the Maryland Commission for Women and the Governor's Commission to Implement the Equal Rights Amendment. In 1978 Ms. Oneglia received the "Woman of the Year for Law and Justice" award from the Prince George's County International Woman of the Year Task Force.

Today the U.S. Constitution does not prohibit distinctions to be made on the basis of sex in the same manner in which it forbids them to be made on the basis of race. This difference is the key to the answer to the question, is ERA needed?

For example, the Constitution did not protect a woman's right to vote until a special constitutional amendment was passed. In an early test case, the U.S. Supreme Court said that the Constitution only guaranteed the protection of those rights that already existed, and, if you are a woman, voting was not one of them.

What happened to the woman who tried? Susan B. Anthony was charged and brought before a criminal court for a jury trial on the crime of self-enfranchisement; this crime carried a potential 3-year jail sentence. When it appeared that her attorney, who was obviously an indefatigable talker, might dissuade the jury with his 3 hours of argument, the judge drew his previously prepared written opinion from his pocket and read it. He found that the 14th amendment did not apply to the issue at hand. He directed the jury to bring in a guilty verdict and then sent them all home.

The same reasoning held in a case that denied women the right to practice law. In that case, the U.S. Supreme Court said:

> This case assumed that it is one of the privileges and immunities of women as citizens to engage in any and every profession, occupation or employment in civil life. It cannot be assumed that this has ever been established as one of the fundamental privileges and immunities of sex. On the contrary, the civil law, as well as nature herself, has always recognized a wide difference in the respective spheres and destinies of man and woman. The harmony, not to say identity of interests and views which belong or should belong to the family institution is repugnant to the idea of a woman adopting a distinct and independent career from that of her husband.

So firmly fixed was this sentiment in the founders of the common law that it became a maxim of that system of jurisprudence that a woman had no legal existence separate from that of her husband. In other words, no woman could work outside of the home regardless of her personal wishes or her personal problems.

You might ask, what about the poor unfortunates, those unmarried women who did not have another

identity with which to merge? The Supreme Court dealt with that problem. It said:

> That indeed many women are unmarried and not affected by any of the duties, complications and incapacities arising out of the marriage state, but these are merely exceptions to the general rule. The paramount mission and destiny of women are to fulfill the noble and divine offices of wife and mother. This is the law of the Creator. And rules of civil society must be adapted to the general constitution of things and cannot be based upon exceptional cases.

In other words, widows, you are without aid, nor are you to aid yourselves.

Most of these cases occurred long after black men were granted the right to vote and to practice in the professions. In fact, in 1948, a mere 6 years before the historic school desegregation opinion, the Supreme Court said that the State of Michigan could deny women the right to tend bar unless the bar was owned by their husbands or fathers. The women who challenged that law earned their living as bartenders, but the Court said:

> The fact that women may now have achieved the virtues that men have long claimed as their prerogatives and now indulge in vices that men have long practiced, does not preclude the State from drawing a sharp line between the sexes.

Yet 30 years before [in 1918] the Supreme Court had said that the right to work without discrimination on the grounds of race or nationality is "the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that is the purpose of the 14th amendment." In other words, the Supreme Court said that it is not permissible to discriminate on the basis of race, but perfectly all right on the basis of sex.

It wasn't until 1971 that the Supreme Court utilized the 14th amendment to strike down law that discriminated on the basis of sex. That year the State of Idaho claimed that in choosing the administrator of an estate, where a man and a woman are equally qualified—that is, of an equal relationship to the deceased—one must always appoint a man. The State's reasoning was that men were generally going to be better qualified because, after all, they have business heads and women do not. Therefore [the reasoning continued], we might as well save the trouble of having a hearing and always appoint a man. The U.S. Supreme Court found that this was an irrational distinction and that women were being denied equal protection of the law. This analysis, however, is almost never used.

The Court has repeatedly declined to look strictly at laws or actions that discriminate on the basis of sex, as opposed to those that discriminate on the basis of race. In fact, in a very recent case, one of the Justices stressed that it would be inappropriate for the Court to do so until the Equal Rights Amendment was passed. Yet, we hear opponents of the Equal Rights Amendment say that we've already got the 14th and 5th amendments, what more do we need? The Supreme Court tells us we need more. We need the ERA.

Long after slavery was abolished, women, especially married women, were denied by law practically all the freedoms that black men were granted after the Civil War. Yet there was not one disability attached to slaves that was not attached to every married woman, whether a housemaid or a millionaire's wife.

The similarity between the legal position of women and slaves was pointed out by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1971:

> Our statute books gradually became laden with the gross stereotype distinctions between the sexes and, indeed, throughout most of the nineteenth century, the position of women in our society was, in many respects, comparable to that of blacks under the pre-Civil War slave code. Neither slaves nor women could hold office, serve on juries, bring suit in their own name, and married women traditionally were denied the legal capacity to hold or convey property or serve as legal guardians of their own children.

The inability to own property is one of those very badges and incidents of slavery that we passed the 13th amendment to eradicate. Slaves, as property themselves, could own no property; by virtue of the legal fiction that the husband and wife were one and *the one* was the husband, the legal right to possession and control of all real property owned by the wife was vested in the husband.

During this time, the wife had no claim on the property, and this principle to this day has not been completely eradicated from American law. The Tennessee Supreme Court has ruled that the disabilities of coverture—and coverture is another word for marriage—are still in effect in that State with respect to property held by the married couple.

(I'm always interested that I take this material from a book which is called *The Disabilities of Infancy, Coverture and Idiocy.)*

In the case of personal property, and by personal property we mean everything else, money, furniture, clothes, jewelry, and so forth, a married woman has absolutely no rights, not even the rights that she retains in the estate of her husband. All of the personal property belonging to the wife, or afterward acquired by her, always passed absolutely to the husband. He could dispose of it by will, but she could not. Mr. Justice Douglas pointed out that one of the disabilities of slaves was their inability to hire out their services, and since a married woman's wages were personal property acquired by her during the marriage, this also fell into the general rule and belonged to her husband absolutely.

Another badge or incident of slavery noted by the Court was the inability of slaves to make contracts. Presumably, since slaves didn't own property, they had nothing to contract about. The same problem applies to married women. In one small way, which, of course, was not a small way, the position of a slave was even better than that of a wife, since at least the master could terminate the slave-master relationship; divorce, on the other hand, was not permitted.

Finally, the father alone was guardian of the children, and on his death, guardianship passed to the person he named in his will, not necessarily to the mother. In the event of a dispute between the parents and a separation, the father was entitled to custody of the children, and the mother was denied even visitation rights. This rule was so firmly implemented that it was applied regardless of the mother's innocence or the father's misconduct. In one English case, a court reluctantly ruled that the children must remain with the father even though he had deserted the mother and had taken the children to live with his mistress.

Now, of course, laws have been passed granting certain of these rights to women in various States, but the United States Constitution does not grant them and will not unless the Equal Rights Amendment is passed.

I am Director of the Task Force on Sex Discrimination. We are charged under a Presidential memorandum to examine the entire Federal Government for sex discrimination. We are looking at laws, regulations, issuances, written and unwritten policies; and we are reporting on the remedies necessary to correct the disparities that exist.

We are finding in a number of governmental systems and institutions which provide benefits and impose burdens that usually the benefits are provided to the men and the burdens are imposed on the women. This is because some of these were written down. Some of these disparities are written as statutes, others as regulations. Some are written or unwritten policies, and many exist simply because of the roles women occupy. Why? Who are these women? Many are poor. Many are old. Many have custody of children. They hold the worst jobs. They get fewer promotions. When they retire, they receive the least amount of money.

We found, for example, in the Farmers Home Administration, a Department of Agriculture program that lends money for rural housing and farms, an entire scheme of written regulations that provided benefits to the borrower, always a man, and burden to the woman, the wife. The lender was allowed to consider the industry of the family in deciding whether to grant the loan. The wife was then held personally liable on the loan, but her name was not necessarily on the title. In most cases, no requirement existed that the wife be notified of foreclosure in case the payments were not made on the loan.

We found that in the income tax code women paid a mighty penalty for getting married. We had thought that at least if there were a marriage penalty (a higher tax paid by two working people when they married, than had they remained single), that this was a tax imposed upon higher income couples. We weren't feeling terribly sorry about two doctors who got married and consequently had to pay higher taxes. We found, however, that 68 percent of this tax is being paid by couples earning less than $25,000 a year. Of couples earning less than $10,000 a year, 83 percent of them pay mightily for the privilege of being married.

We found that in the social security system if you had a one-earner family—a working husband and a dependent wife and children—if he earned $800 per month while he was working, upon retirement, he and his wife, with the wife's benefits, would have a total benefit of $786. If that same couple were a two-earner couple, earning the same amount of money but $600 was earned by the husband and $200 was earned by the wife, their benefit at retirement would be cut to $669 per month.

In the U.S. civil service system, we looked at the retirement system and found that poorly paid women—and by that I mean the overwhelming majority of women, since 75 percent of them are in the bottom four grades and only 2 percent of them are in the top three grades—subsidized the retirement benefits of the retired grade 15s. The retirement system of civil service is set up to benefit only long term, highly paid employees: it uses the earnings and the contributions of lower paid, shorter term employees to pay for the retirement of others.

We found that in the Internal Revenue tax forms the wife is held liable for the taxes on income that she didn't earn if she signs a joint return. She's liable for the truth of the statements made on that joint return, even though the chances are she didn't have much to do with filling it out. On the other hand, if there is a deficiency, and the tax isn't paid, she is not required by law to be notified. She's not going to know until the marshal arrives at the door.

We found that it is important to provide employment and training programs for persons on welfare. We find that the law contains a prohibition against sex discrimination right in its body. It says you shall not discriminate on the basis of sex. Yet, the law also says that priority shall be given to unemployed fathers in providing employment training.

We found that there is a welfare program which provides benefits for unemployed fathers, its purpose being to not force the husband/father from the home so that his family would qualify for welfare. If the mother is the breadwinner, however, and she loses her job, *no benefits are paid to her.* That's written in the statute. It's very clear. It's discriminatory on its face.

We found that the Civil Aeronautics Board has permitted a rule to go into effect permitting airlines to deny passage to pregnant women as handicapped persons. Not all pregnant women, mind you, but at the discretion of the pilot, boarding can be denied. We analyzed this and thought maybe they are afraid there will be a medical emergency, which makes some sense. Then we thought about all the other people who have risks for medical emergencies, such as heart conditions, and we noted that certain other categories of people—obese people and frail people—were not considered handicapped for the same purpose. So we don't know what the reason is. The only thing we do know is that when a special fare is provided for the benefit of handicapped persons, pregnant women are not among those who get the special fare.

We have found an entire scheme of discriminatory laws, and I've given you just some examples, from the absurd to those that really cause great hardship to people. They will not be eliminated until the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution is passed.

Thank you.

3. Panel Discussion

Cecilia Preciado de Burciaga

Ms. Burciaga is assistant provost for faculty affairs at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. She is a member of the Committee on Minority Graduate Education, Educational Testing Service; the Committee on Opportunities in Science, American Association for the Advancement of Science; and the National Advisory Committee on Women to the President of the United States.

My perspective on the rights of women comes essentially from two windows: one, that of a minority woman—I am Chicana, Mexican American—and two, that of the world of higher education. I work at Stanford University, a prestigious institution. The slogan, "You've come a long way, baby," is certainly not true on either front.

I focus on the minority women issue because I feel strongly that it is primarily the reason why I am involved in the women's movement. Minority women still face double-barreled jeopardy, discrimination on the basis of sex and race in every aspect of our personal and professional lives. I am here because of my deep conviction that the groups which will gain the most from the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment are minority women and housewives.

There is a stereotype that abounds in this country that says that minorities are in fact now a privileged class, that they are more the benefactors of this system than anyone else. Minority women face that false steretoype doubly.

A very personal example is my walking into a university presidential staff meeting and seeing only men, with the exception of one other woman, who is, in fact, the secretary. The feeling that I get is one of immediate inhibition. I question whether it comes because I am a woman, therefore suspect. Everyone, it seems, assumes that I am there because of affirmative action, not because of my own qualifications. Or does it come because I am a minority and another "burden" to live down? Yet, the [International Women's Year] conference in Houston did prove that diversity translates into strength.

Every woman in this room still faces limitations on where and when she can work, on whether she can get a mortgage or control her property on the same basis as a man, on whether she can start a business, on how she can terminate a business. More fundamentally, each woman in this country still lacks the very simple legal status of being considered as a person. In the most basic sense, although we are 53 percent of the population, we have not yet realized the promise of the American dream; we have been in legal bondage for 200 years.

I find it very sobering that the only constitutional right I have is the right to vote. You look at thousands of words that have been printed on this issue, and that's what it really boils down to, one constitutional right. We gained that after an amendment. So again, it will take another amendment to grant me and you the fundamental equal protection under the law. Those of you who know the issues know that this issue is not a new one. The ERA was first introduced in 1923, and since that date, we've been waiting for each person, man or woman, to receive equal benefits and share equal responsibility based on our personhood.

I am here because I don't want to have to answer to my 4-year-old and my 2-year-old, boy and girl, as to why they still don't have equal rights 3 years from now.

As a minority woman, I know that it is easier to legislate laws than to enforce them. Look at the desegregation decision of 1954 and its results in 1978. The effects are still not well-entrenched in the system. I am here to remind all of us that legislation is one thing, enforcement is entirely another one.

Thank you very much.

Anne Follis

Ms. Follis is a certified lay speaker in the United Methodist Church; she teaches adult Sunday school classes. As national president of Housewives for ERA, she says that the organization "represents the vast, silent majority of American homemakers, contrary to the myths about ERA." She has been featured in many television programs and magazine articles, including ***Redbook Magazine,*** *May 1978, as one of 10 Illinois women who are "making it happen." In addition to being a homemaker, she is a wife, a mother, and a professional.*

I'm a homemaker. I'm the national president of Housewives for ERA. We have buttons that say, "Im a Housewife for ERA." My husband says I should get one for myself that says, "I used to be a housewife before ERA." Sometimes I think he's right. But I am a homemaker. I'm still the homemaker at our house, although I'm gone a little more than I used to be. I believe that homemaking and the nurturing and the care that it entails is the most important job in this country. I am totally convinced of this, and the more I look into this, the more I believe it. We must uplift the homemaker.

According to Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, "from childhood on, every American woman is taught to believe that the highest calling in life is to be a wife and mother. She has the right to expect that American law will protect her in this right." I'm going to show you how little protection the homemaker actually has.

The U.S. Constitution and most State laws were based on English common law. Two hundred years ago common law said that when a man and woman were married they become one and *that one* was the husband. Common law literally regarded the wife as the property of her husband. That law lives on today. It certainly does not put American homemakers on a pedestal as many people mistakenly believe that it does. I think the whole thing is best summed up by the footnote found frequently in law journals that reads, "The above is not applicable to children, idiots and married women."

Current laws and court rulings based on this principle are endless, and they never cease to amaze me. For example, in Arkansas, homestead rights belong solely to the husband. This means that husbands can choose, abandon, and sell homesteads at will without the wife's consent, since the State presumes that all personal property, including the household furnishings, belongs to him. To protect her personal property (something that she may have brought into the marriage when she got married) from her husband's selling it or from seizure by his creditor, a married woman in Arkansas must file a record of her separate property with the county recorder. If she does not do that, then she has to prove in court that she bought the property with her separate money. She may be working at home entertaining his business associates, and canning and darning and sewing and doing all the little things that homemakers do to strech a dollar, but it's not her money. Her money is only the money that she worked outside of the home to earn. If she didn't get it that way, then it's his.

In West Virginia the courts have decided that when a wife earns money working in her husband's business, those earnings don't belong to the wife. They belong to the husband. In Maine, if a couple jointly runs and owns a business, even if the wife is putting the most effort into keeping the business intact and the husband is not taking care of his share of the responsibility, all of the profit that they get from that business legally does not belong to the wife; it belongs to the husband, and she has no claim to it. If he chooses to take the money and run, he can do it. If he chooses to take it and gamble it all or spend it irresponsibly, or put it in a bank and keep his family in poverty conditions, he can do that. She has no claim to it.

A Georgia husband can completely disinherit his wife. However, a woman may, if she wants to, go to court and petition the court for 1 year's support to be paid out of his estate. One year's support seems a meager reward for years and years of devotion to your home and your family. Children in Alabama rate above their mother in inheriting when there is no will and the husband dies. However, if the wife dies, the husband, of course, ranks above the

children in inheriting. In Vermont the courts may prevent a woman from breaking her husband's will; however, the courts have no right to prevent such action if the surviving spouse is male.

In 1915 the Oklahoma Supreme Court ruled that "contracts between a husband and wife are invalid because a wife has no legal existence." Now think for a minute. Can you imagine a court ruling in effect today saying that black people or Jewish people or Mexican Americans have no legal existence? Everybody in this room and in the State of Nevada and in the United States, with a few exceptions, would be outraged. We would demand constitutional underpinning to protect these people from this kind of a principle. Yet for married women in most States this principle is always there to rear its ugly head when women don't have specific statute protection, and even statute protection can be taken away.

In 1944 the Florida Supreme Court ruled that when a woman finds her mate, "incompetency seizes her." I was married 10 years ago. I didn't know that the minute that I said, "I do," that I was suddenly seized with incompetence, but according to the Florida Supreme Court, that's what happens to women when they find their mate.

The Ohio Supreme Court ruled that, "the wife is at best a superior servant to her husband, only chattel, with no personality, no property and no legally recognized feelings or rights." That must be from the dark ages, right? Wrong! That was a 1970 ruling.

Even a wife's right to be supported by her husband is entrenched in a common law principle that regards the husband as the head of the family and the wife as his property, and this is for all practical purposes completely unenforceable in an ongoing marriage. A woman can be the most devoted wife and mother in the world, she can entertain and keep house beautifully and buy $30 worth of groceries and make it last a year—I buy $30 worth of groceries, you can put it in the glove compartment, but this is a superwife, okay? This doesn't make any difference. Her husband can spend his money gambling, or he can squander it on other women, or he can be just plain irresponsible, or he can put it in the bank and keep his family at poverty conditions. The wife has no legal means [in many States] to obtain anything from him that he does not choose to give her unless she breaks up her family and sues for divorce. The so-called right to support that some people claim keeps families together can actually create reasons for splitting them apart.

These are just a few examples of the very precarious and low legal status of homemakers in this country, and if that's a pedestal, I think most of us will take equality any day. Homemakers are more than breadmakers. They are family makers. Homemakers who devote their lives, their energies, and their skills to their families need the protection of the law. Present law does not guarantee the homemakers any say in any family decision. Laws need to recognize the economic partnership of marriage. In other words, the homemaker is not property, she's contributing equally. Laws need to recognize the economic partnership of marriage, the nonmonetary contribution of the homemaker as an equal contribution to that of the wage earner, and laws should give the spouses equal legal rights.

Some people really feel that this is going to destroy or threaten the family. Since I'm a very strong believer in the family, I think that this fear is utterly groundless and unfounded. To quote Walter Lippman, "We do almost no single, sensible, deliberate thing to make family life a success and still the family survives. It has survived all manner of stupidity. It will survive the application of intelligence." Thank you very much.

Mary Gojack

Ms. Gojack was born and raised on an Iowa farm and came to Nevada in 1954. She has a B.A. in political science, history, and secondary education. Currently, she is completing an M.A. in political science. Ms. Gojack was elected to the Nevada Assembly in 1972 and to the Nevada Senate in 1974. She is a member of Sierra Arts Foundation, American Association of University Women, Women's Political Caucus, National Organization for Women, and many other civic and community organizations. She cochaired the last two Democratic State conventions. Ms. Gojack is consumer affairs officer for the Nevada National Bank and assistant to the president of the Nevada National Bank.

As a member of the Nevada legislature for the previous 6 years, I thought it would be perhaps the most helpful if I could do a recap of what has happened in that particular body and get out my crystal ball and maybe make predictions for the future.

In listening to some of the earlier comments here this evening, it just triggered so many things that I would like to respond to. Ms. Burciaga said, in the closing part of her remarks, that it's easier to legislate laws than to enforce them. That made me a little nervous. Because if it's easier to legislate laws than to enforce them, we really do have a serious problem in this State of Nevada. Any and all laws that have been introduced in the previous sessions that would do much of anything in terms of real redress for women and other minority groups have a rather startling rate of failure.

One of the areas where I've done a lot of research lately that really does, and yet it does not, pertain to the Nevada Legislature and legislative history is the whole issue of women and witchcraft and why women are witches and why witches are women. All of the things that have been discussed so far this evening continue to reinforce my belief that the whole notion of women and witchcraft is very much alive and well in the 20th century United States today. If you'll look at the history of witchcraft, it was generally based on some sort of social disruption that had to do with economics. The economics today are the inflation that forces so many women to seek some job to supplement the family income. That displacement strikes fear in the hearts of a number of people, if there's any kind of competition for the available jobs. This is the root of what we are facing today.

The articles that I have read in a number of newspapers and magazines lately refer to some composite woman who is working, but doesn't need to be working; and so, no matter what the motive for the second breadwinner in the family, it somehow becomes some kind of an evil motive if it's a woman involved.

The last several weeks, there has been a series of articles regarding women in the work force in the *Wall Street Journal.* One of the columns was devoted entirely to the upper income levels of families and the questionable necessity for a woman whose husband was a professional and she a professional, of both of them being in the work force. The same questions arose as far as lower economic groups and their needs are concerned. That is, in the latter situation, a grudging stamp of approval was given to the woman who was working to supplement family income.

If you'll just look around, especially watch the next session of the Nevada Legislature, some of the arguments you'll hear go back to the ancient beliefs as far as witchcraft is concerned. I think that we are very much in the same place that those poor, usually elderly, widowed women were in Europe in the Middle Ages and in England, who went around with their tin cups begging, and the door would be slammed in their faces because the village itself was a poverty village and most didn't have anything to give them. Later, if some kind of misfortune would fall on that family, they would remember that a widow, that elderly woman, had come to their door, and so she immediately became charged with being a witch and very often was burned at the stake. Her burning diffused the need to deal with the larger social and economic issues. I think that's what's happening now. Many things are happening, and people remember that some women came around and they asked for some help, some assistance, and that therefore whatever kind of bad thing has fallen on society is the fault of that person. Society needs a scapegoat. Women have historically been those scapegoats.

We have one example from the last session of the Nevada Legislature in the rhetoric regarding the Equal Rights Amendment. Why could we not pass the Equal Rights Amendment? Women had to be put on a pedestal. Women had to be protected, particularly the homemaker. We heard so many of the senators, since that was the body that I was in the last time, orate on why we needed to protect the fair flower of womanhood, the sanctity of the home, protect the pedestal usually reserved for the woman who is exclusively a homemaker. Based on that, many of the men and women who voted against the Equal Rights Amendment were able to rationalize their *no* vote.

Two or 3 weeks later, the Displaced Homemaker Act—displaced homemaker, that's what a lot of those witches always were—came up for a vote. It came up for a vote three different times in the Nevada Senate Finance Committee, only to be defeated every time. The argument this time against the Displaced Homemaker Act was, "Oh, we didn't need it, and who were these women anyway, and what was a displaced homemaker?" Generally, the thrust of the Displaced Homemaker Act is for women in their middle years, usually from 40 to 62, the women who fall through the cracks where there is no public assistance to come to their aid, that somehow they've brought it on themselves. Whether their husband has been disabled on the job,

deceased, or there has been a divorce or separation—it doesn't matter whose fault it is; somehow it always comes back that it's the woman's fault, and therefore the legislature simply could not justify the meager amount of funding that we had asked for to fund a pilot program for the displaced homemakers for 2 years. Keep in mind this was the same State legislature that could at the same time provide $180,000 in startup funds to research the wonder drug Gerivotal.

There are other areas of need and other pieces of social legislation that failed in the past session of the legislature, and my prediction is that many of them are going to fail again. It's not due to the lack of good will on the part of a *few* people or the efforts of some of the people who are here in this room tonight who will be either lobbying that legislature or who will be members of that legislature. The problem is, you and I are in the minority. We are in the minority, whatever our sex, our race, our ethnic background, and we are certainly in the minority in terms of having the vote in the Nevada Legislature for these issues.

I wish I could be more positive. Perhaps we will get a few crumbs thrown our way, but I think that in Nevada we're quite a few years from actually getting the kind of redress that we would like to see in our Nevada Legislature. I would like to conclude that this simply underscores the need for a constitutional amendment, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so that we have some rights and benefits when we can't find them within our own State chief policymaking body. Then we will at least have some protection from the United States Constitution, some place to turn for help. Thank you.

Mildred Jeffrey

Ms. Jeffrey is chair of the National Women's Political Caucus; she was one of the founding members of the caucus in 1971. Ms. Jeffrey has an M.A. in social economics and research from Bryn Mawr. She was the first director of the Women's Department of the United Auto Workers, 1945–49. The many awards she has received include Ten Outstanding Women of Detroit and the Civil Liberties Human Rights Council. She is vice chair of the Board of Governors, Wayne State University, and a member of the National Advisory Committee on Women to the President of the United States.

I am from the National Women's Political Caucus, and it is our belief and our philosophy, since we were organized back in July 1971, that if we want to achieve social change in this country, we must get women activized, politicized, and elected to public office. So that is what it seems to me the Nevada Legislature needs, and a lot of other State legislatures too.

I certainly was impressed with the figures on the promotions of women and the appointments of women to top supervisory and policy positions by the Governor. I shall carry that message back to a few States where Governors' records are not as good. The caucus, in addition to the election of women, is also very interested in the appointment of women.

As I listened to these quotes from the Supreme Court of the United States and State supreme courts, I was reminded vividly of one of the worst statistics that we have in the United States of America, that in the Federal judiciary, of over 500 appointed positions, 12 are women. This includes the Supreme Court of the United States, on which no woman has ever served, and also the district courts and the appeal courts throughout the Federal judiciary. I believe that when there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States, and there will be one of these days, that women and feminists will be united in this country as we have never been before, and we will say to President Jimmy Carter, "We want a woman because we are tired of having men make the decisions that affect our daily lives."

One good note is that the Congress has passed what is known as the Omnibus Judge Bill, which will add 152 new judges to the Federal district courts and the appeal courts. The caucus has been negotiating with the President on this for a long time now. He has promised that many of those appointments to new judgeships will go to women and minorities. That means that in your State you should be looking for qualified candidates now and get their names to your United States Senators.

I draw your attention to a publication of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission produces some of the finest reports of any agency in our government. The one that I have in my hand is called *Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women.* It is a very recent report. A principle theme of anti-ERA opponents is that we really don't need the ERA because things are getting so much better and so much progress is being made.

There is, they say, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Title IX of the Educational Opportunities Act, and so on, and things are getting much better. This report is one of the most distressing analyses that I've read in a long time. What does it show? What does it tell us? It tells us that in education, in relationship to the [white] male majority of this country, women are slipping behind.

Remember, women are entering and staying in the labor market. Fifty percent of the women of this country are employed, according to a recent report by the U.S. Department of Labor, which says we don't know why women are entering the labor market.

I'll tell you why they are entering the labor market, and why they're going to stay in it. It's inflation, the cost of housing, food, health care, and other necessities of life. Women are in the labor market to stay. Women work because we need to work.

The Commission report further shows that women, whatever age, whatever race, whatever ethnic background, whatever educational attainment, whatever economic status, including single head of household, suffer greater unemployment than men in this country. And women have fewer financial resources. We get less unemployment compensation because we earn less; we have less in the bank and less of other resources.

We think that lots of job opportunities have opened up, that we have access to the nontraditional jobs. Wrong again, the report says. Women are clustered even more in the traditional jobs than we were 20 years ago—whether it's as a secretary or clerk or as a hospital attendant or retail clerk or cosmetology, occupations where the salary or hourly rates are set on the basis of the sex of the person who occupies the job, not the education, skill required, or experience. So we aren't getting all those new jobs that we keep being told we are. Some, sure.

What about women's earnings? This report shows that women earn, in the United States of America in 1978, 50 percent of what the male majority in our country earns.

I'm not saying at this point that the Equal Rights Amendment will correct all of these inequities, but it is a first big step. It is the beginning of dealing with the inequities and injustices and unfairness that women of all races and creeds, ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds suffer in our country.

We come to you from another State. We come to ask your help on behalf of 105 million women, on behalf of the 35 States that have ratified the ERA and in which 75 percent of the people live. We are coming to say to you, "On behalf of justice, ratify, be the 36th or 37th or 38th State. Help women all over the country because, without your help, all the rest of are not going to have the benefit of equality of rights in the Constitution." Public opinion all over the country, not only in the Nation as a whole but in every region of the country, supports ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. I'm quite sure on November 7 the voters will make that clear in your State, too.

In conclusion, in November 1977, the magnificent National Conference of Women took place in Houston, and prior to that, there were State meetings in 50 States and in the 6 territories in which women of very diverse backgrounds and views assembled together. In Houston, we adopted a National Plan for Action. There was the most representative gathering that has ever taken place in our country.

Following that, on July 9, 1978, there was the march in Washington: 100,000 women and men, children, grandparents, marching on that hot, humid day for equal rights. Then there was that magnificent lobby effort, the great coalition in and across the country and in Washington for ERA extension. As I stand here, I know I am looking into the eyes of many of you who made the extension effort successful. This coalition was the most beautiful, the most extensive coalition—church, labor, civil rights, civic and professional groups, and lots more—this year in Washington and across the country on any measure. And we won. I think we have together the potential of a great political force in our country that gives me great hope and great belief that in your State and in two other States, before very long, we will have our dream realized, and we will have ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Walter Nowak

A resident of Las Vegas for 14 years, Father Nowak is codirector of the Center for United Campus Ministry and a visiting assistant professor in physical science at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. He has taught science at secondary and university levels. He is active locally in youth work.

In terms of my own capability of relating to the major questions here, I am a person who has to struggle through a lot of changes, information, and experiences. I have had to come from an environment where I was not aware of these situations as I grew up, even though my mother worked for 35 years in a factory and did not speak English. At the time that I was born, neither did my father. Slowly I began to realize that I can relate to minorities in a number of ways as a result of the kind of background that I came from. It has been a learning experience for me over the last 20 to 30 years as I encountered discrimination that I wasn't conscious of—discrimination due to color, discrimination due to sex.

I was lucky, I guess, in my existence. I never really felt seriously discriminated against. But as I've come to learn about it, I've come to see the problem more from a moral basis, a sense of moral responsibility. I'd like to read one or two statements that have helped me to understand what my own moral responsibility is in regard to the questions that we have considered tonight.

I would like to read a short statement from the constitution of the Church of the Modern World. That is a document put out by the Second Vatican Council.

> With respect to the fundamental rights of the person, every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language or condition is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God's intent.

This type of statement I find very strong.

In another segment of the documents put out by the Second Vatican Council, the constitution of the church, there's a quotation that is based on scripture. It is another statement that I feel bears a lot of reflective thought. 1There is therefore in the church no inequality on the basis of race, nationality, social condition or sex, because, there's neither jew nor gentile, there's neither slave nor freeman, there's neither male nor female, for we all one of Jesus Christ.

That is based on a quotation from Paul, who in other circumstances is looked upon as someone who had a restrictive view of the role of women.

In 1971 an encyclical was written by Pope Paul VI, who just died about 2 months ago, which was in response to the 80th anniversary of another social action encyclical, published by Leo XIII. In this particular encyclical, Pope Paul has a short paragraph on the role of women.

> Similarly, in many countries, a charter which would put an end to actual discrimination and would establish relationships of equality and rightness and of respect for their dignity is the subject of study and at times of lively demand.

It would seem to refer to the United States.

> We do not have in mind that false equality which would deny the distinctions laid down by the Creator himself and which would be in contradiction with women's proper role, which is of such capital importance at the heart of the family, as well as within society. Developments in legislation should on the contrary be directed to protecting her proper vocation.

This last part is very interesting.

> And at the same time, recognizing her independence as a person and her equal rights to participate in cultural, economic, social and political life.

These statements remind me that in my own background I had been taught that rights, or moral claims which one person can make on another person, are based on the dignity of the person. The dignity of the person flows from the fact that we are all equally created by God and that we are made in the image of God, and as a consequence, we all have rights. These rights include the right to work, to a just wage, to property, to participation, to judicial protection, to education, freedom of speech, assembly, association, the right to worship, and the right to immigrate and emigrate. These are listed in other encyclicals.

If it is the nature and dignity of the person that underlies these rights, then we cannot deny that women are persons just as much as men are persons. They have the same rights that all of us should share together. It is from this aspect that I make my own comments tonight. I thank you for allowing me to be present and to have an equal opportunity to speak to you tonight.

Jan L. Tyler

Ms. Tyler is currently studying for a Ph.D. in educational administration at the University of Utah. She has held two positions with the Utah State Department of Social Services. She was assistant

professor of child development and family relations and director of the Family Consultation Center, Brigham Young University. She has been listed in ***Community Leaders and Noteworthy Americans*** *and* ***Outstanding Young Women of America.*** *She serves on the Utah Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, Advisory Committee for Family and Consumer Studies. She chaired the coordinating committee of the Utah Women's Conference.*

I sit before you a woman of 13 years old. I say that because it has been 13 years since my awakening as a woman with its fullest implications. Sometimes it takes a crucial personal decision to cause us to begin to look within and ask questions we never before asked. It was 13 years ago after an engagement that I had to ask the question as to whether or not I would go ahead and enter into a marriage.

There were three things that I turned over in my mind in the process of making that decision. Number one, I knew that if I made that choice I would be marrying outside of my faith, which would be a crucial decision. Number two, I knew also by making that decision that I would enter into a marriage that would be a childless marriage, and that too was crucial. For some of you who may be "zero population" advocates, I will shock you and say I always believed that psychologically, physically, and emotionally I was equipped to have 12 children and that's what I wanted. I have not married. I do not have 12 children, with the exception of those 12 who are willed to me by three different families.

The third decision was that I would be totally submissive to the profession of the individual that I was to marry. In other words, this individual was a professional musician on the concert circuit and I would work with him as a partner, if you will, in providing the emotion to something he was already technically capable of handling, but didn't have that other aspect; so, we were to be a great team and hit the world of fame and fortune. However, I did not make the decision to enter into that marriage because of those three pivotal aspects. As I suggested to you, I had to look within and begin to ask myself some very serious questions about being a woman, particularly in today's society.

I went to Arizona State University, and three things happened simultaneously that acted as a catalyst to begin this process of awakening that I refer to. First of all, because my course of study at the master's level was psychology and counseling, I entered into a group, which was a requirement as part of our academic experience. The particular group that I entered into was a group of all women. I didn't understand the implications of our discussions at the time, but we were married, we were single, we were divorced, we were old, we were young, we were outspoken, we were hesitant—I refer particularly to myself; I used to be a tremendously shy individual. That was one event, and it caused things to happen to me on a very personal level.

The second event that happened to me is that I was made the president of the Relief Society organization, which is the highest position a woman can achieve on a local level within my religion, which is Mormon. So being placed in that position, I suddenly found myself, in many cases, a spiritual counselor. As I listened to women and their personal problems, I can remember saying to myself, at that time, "In the very near future, the questions I hear women asking and the questions I am asking are going to be a greater problem for the LDS church to deal with than even the black problem has been for them, to date." That was the statement I made to myself *12 years ago.*

The third thing that happened to me is that I was placed on the university president's Commission on the Status of Women. When I said yes to that, I did not know what I was saying yes to. But it was our task to examine exactly what was happening to women in that particular institution of higher education. Believe me, the first time we sat down and began to analyze the statistics of that institution, I could not believe it. I was absolutely astounded.

With those three areas of myself going out and running to doors and looking through windows that had never been opened to me before, suddenly the seeds of awareness began to seep through every single level of my consciousness—physically, mentally, emotionally, and spiritually.

I think what is happening today is that the hearts of the daughters are being turned to our foremothers, because many of us have been actively involved and engaged in researching what's happened. What were the early women of this Nation saying? We've been digging in archives and musty boxes and blowing off the cobwebs and finding some very enlightening things. For example, in the State Constitution of Utah in 1896, Article IV, Section 1, was included an equal rights clause that was almost

the very same wording as the national proposed amendment; and in examining the laws in that State, we have over 100 statutes and laws that are unconstitutional.

Also in the research that I have done regarding the early women of the State of Utah, there is a phrase that we found frequently in the diaries—they said that they were "moved upon by the inspiration of their times." They were responding to the pulse of their times, and, remember, Utah is a State that had women who were the first to exercise the franchise—the right to vote. So our early history is very inconsistent with what is happening today.

When people ask me how I, as a member of the dominant religion in that State, can take the position that I have consistently taken on the issues of women, I simply respond that there is a bit of me that was present in Mother Eve.

In spite of the authoritative thundering voice that forbade her to stretch forth her hand and pick of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, she did indeed do that, though many would have us believe she consequently has cursed all of the human race, particularly women (and we're often told that we're living out that curse). Contrary to that belief, she did bless humankind. So, many of us stretch forth our hand for the concept of equality because of that which we also possess similar to Mother Eve.

In the last month and a half in particular, I have noticed in the State of Utah a tremendous aboutface among individuals who, up to this point, have remained very quiet about this issue, with probable cause, because there has been a great deal of fear about speaking out. But, nonetheless, there has been an overwhelming change, and we are finding that we have contacts from all over the Nation and outside of the country, including Canada and Mexico. Individuals who have similar concerns are suddenly gaining the courage to speak out.

In Christendom, there is recorded that when there is work for a woman to perform, a task for her to perform, she is the one who is approached, such as was the case of Mary. It was she who was approached first, and then Joseph was later informed about her particular task and her condition. As was the custom of the times, any unmarried women in her condition could be stoned to death if the man selected not to marry her. So it was a decision that Joseph had to make, whether or not he would support her so that he could facilitate her carrying out her task, or whether or not she would indeed be stoned. We are aware, as is recorded by history, what his choice was. I think the analogy is similar today.

Women have a sense and a consciousness of a task that is to be performed; that is, to wreak a tremendous change upon this society for the better; and now the modern-day Josephs may make their choice, whether in fact they will pick up the stone or shoulder the responsibilities.

I find it an irony that Liberty and Justice are both depicted as women. The irony in this country, of course, is that both liberty and justice have been least experienced legally by women. Liberty and Justice are sisters, and we must translate the implication.

I agree with what has been said in terms of the importance of the Equal Rights Amendment; but I suppose as a single woman in our society I am conscious of the fact, if you are not possessed by a man, there is the assumption that you are public property, which is offensive to me.

I think that there are many challenges that face us as men and as women in this society. One I suggest to you as we move forward in progress is that we must get out of our own skins. For example, one of the things that I heard over and over and over again—and I understand this, but nonetheless it causes me concern because I never hear the other side of it—is that people have to understand the plight or the condition of the married woman in this Nation. Yet, I have never heard the other side of the coin, which is that it's just as important to understand the conditions and the plight of the single woman—be they never-married or widowed or divorced. As hard as I attempt to empathize with my married friends and my sisters and sisters-in-law and my grandmothers, I find, even with my own family, it's difficult for them to deal with me as a single woman. So we must get out of our skins and begin to understand.

If I have never experienced discrimination, does that mean that no other woman has experienced discrimination? If I have been married and I have always had the best that is possible in life, does that mean that all women have that same condition? If I happen to land one of those choice positions where I'm making more than $25,000 a year and have a lot of advantages, does that mean that every woman in this Nation is doing so?

An effect that I see happening is that women are beginning to see the world through the men's eyes,

because being a man in our society is not always all it's cracked up to be. Those of us who have broken through some of the barriers and have worked as administrators find out how difficult the world of work has been made for the man. I do not wonder at the medical and sociological and psychological results of that world, which must be changed for both men and women.

Another thing that we must begin to do is that we've got to stop cannibalizing each other. Whether we are on the far right or the far left, to continue verbally and publicly to be destructive toward each other is not a firm foundation upon which to build a future nation of peace.

A third thing is, what are we willing to place on the line for those things that we believe? I feel that, even though the battle today has been difficult in our struggle for rights, we are still battling a war in luxury compared to the hardships that the early people of this Nation who fought this same battle have gone through. I don't see too many women and men laying every dollar they have on the line when something is destroyed, such as early schoolhouses being burned down, being built again a second and a third time and a fourth time. I feel that, even when the Equal Rights Amendment is attached to the Constitution, we are going to enter into a period where we are going to have to be willing to lay more on the line than we have.

I also feel that in this movement (the women's rights movement) we must begin to follow the example of our sisters in Europe who received the Nobel Peace Prize and begin to weave the fabric of peace into a Nation which has engaged in war as long as I have been alive. I was born during the Second World War.

I'd like to close with two thoughts. One is from C.S. Lewis, found in his essay on the "Weight of Glory." He said, "It is a serious thing to live in a society of possible gods and goddesses. . . ." The implications are profound! The other quote was made by a man in the early days of Greece. Inequities and injustices "will never be done away with until those who are *not* affected become just as indignant as those who *are*." Thank you.

4. Informational Resources

Federal Government Agencies

Commission on Civil Rights
Women's Rights Program Unit
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1121 Vermont Ave. N.W., Room 410
Washington, D.C. 20425
(202) 254-8127

Department of Commerce
Task Force on Women Business Owners
Main Commerce Bldg., Room 6863
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230
(202) 377-5770

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
1832 M St., N.W., Suite 821
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 653-5846

National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape
National Institute of Mental Health
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Md. 20857
(301) 443-1910

Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Room 3062 North
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-6606

The Program for Women's Concerns
Office of the Director
National Institute on Drug Abuse
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Md. 20852
(301) 433-3693

Women's Action Program
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
330 Independence Ave., S.W., Room 3059 North
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-6606

Women's Program Office
Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3121
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-2181

Women's Research Program
National Institute of Education

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
1200 19th St., N.W., Room 815
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 254-5406

Department of Housing and Urban Development
Women's Program Division
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th St., S.W., Room 3234
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-6525

Department of Justice
Task Force on Sex Discrimination
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Safeway Bldg.
521 12th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 724-6758

Department of Labor
Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee for Women
c/o Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W., Room S3002
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202) 523-6611

National Advisory Committee for Women
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W., Room C5321
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202) 523-6707

Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W., Room S3002
Washington, D.C. 20210
(202) 523-6611

Department of State
International Women's Programs
U.S. Department of State
2201 C St., N.W., Room 1427
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-6906

Office of Women and Development
Agency for International Development
U.S. Department of State
2201 C St., N.W., Room 3243
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 632-3992

Office of Personnel Management (formerly U.S. Civil Service Commission)
Federal Women's Program
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
1900 E St., N.W., Room 7540
Washington, D.C. 20415
(202) 632-6870

U.S. Congress
Congressional Clearinghouse on Women's Rights
U.S. House of Representatives
722 House Annex, Building No. 4
Washington, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-2947

White House
Interdepartmental Task Force on Women
c/o Sarah Weddington
Office of Public Liaison
White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
(202) 456-6585

Selected National Organizations

American Association of University Women
2401 Virginia Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 785-7750

American Civil Liberties Union
Legislative Office
600 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 544-1681

Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P St., N.W., Suite 508
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 872-1770

Chicana Rights Project
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
c/o Pat M. Vasquez

501 Petroleum Commerce Bldg.
201 North St. Mary's St.
San Antonio, Tex. 78205
(512) 224-5476

Coalition of Labor Union Women
15 Union Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 255-7800

ERAmerica
1525 M St., N.W., Suite 605
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-4354

Federally Employed Women, Inc.
487 National Press Bldg., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20045
(202) 638-4404

Housewives for ERA
1108 South Blvd.
Evanston, Ill. 60202

League of Women Voters
1730 M St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-1770

Mexican American Women's National Association
L'Enfant Plaza Station, S.W.
P.O. Box 23656
Washington, D.C. 20024
(703) 521-0097

National Alliance of Black Women Feminists
202 South State St., Suite 1024
Chicago, Ill. 60604
(312) 939-0107

National Association for Girls and Women in Sports
1201 16th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-5540

National Association of Commissions for Women
926 J St., Room 1014
Sacramento, Calif. 95814
(916) 444-9196

National Association of Cuban American Women
3900 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

National Association of Spanish Speaking-Spanish Surnamed Nurses
c/o Ilduara Murillo-Rhode
School of Nursing, SC-72
University of Washington
Seattle, Wash. 98195
(206) 543-9455

National Black Feminist Organization
2802 Hillcrest Parkway
Hillcrest Heights, Md. 20031
(202) 899-1327

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
c/o Bonnie Tinker, Chairperson
P.O. Box 40132
Portland, Oreg. 97240
(503) 281-8275 or 281-2442

National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
c/o Office of Women in Higher Education
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-4692

National Committee Concerned with Asian Wives of U.S. Servicemen
Bok-Lim Kim, Chairperson
1207 West Oregon
Urbana, Ill. 61801
(217) 333-2261

National Committee on Household Employment
7705 Georgia Ave., N.W., Suite 208
Washington, D.C. 20012
(202) 291-2422

National Conference of Puerto Rican Women
Cleveland Park Station
P.O. Box 4804
Washington, D.C. 20008

National Council of Jewish Women
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2588

National Council of Negro Women
1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 832
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 223-2363

National NOW (National Organization for Women) Action Center
425 13th St., N.W., Room 1001
Pennsylvania Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 347-2279

National Women's Education Fund
1532 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 462-8606

National Women's Health Network
2025 I St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 223-6886

National Women's Political Caucus
1411 K St., N.W., Suite 1110
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 347-4456

North American Indian Women's Association
c/o Mary Jane Fate, National President
SR 3 Box 30586
Fairbanks, Alaska 9970?

Organization of Pan Asia Women
719 Fern Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20012

Rural American Women, Inc.
1522 K St., N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 785-4700

Women's Equity Action League
805 15th St., N.W., Suite 822
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 638-4560

Women's Law Project
112 South 16th St., Suite 1012
Philadelphia, Pa. 19102
(215) 564-6280

Women's Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
1010 Vermont Ave., N.W., Room 210
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-1123

Women's Lobby, Inc.
201 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 547-0044

Women's Rights Project
Center for Law and Social Policy
1751 N St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 872-0670